



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2019

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/D/19/3221273

Dean Croft, High Street, Guilden Morden SG8 0JP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Mansfield against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref S/3480/18/FL, dated 12 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Guilden Morden Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated just south of the village of Guilden Morden, along High Street, which is within the Guilden Morden Conservation Area (the CA). This part of the village has an open, informal and linear character and there is a pattern of shared driveways serving detached dwellings along this section of High Street which are set back within their plots. The shared driveways are interspersed by large grassed verges planted with trees or hedges. To the front of the appeal site is a banked verge together with a hedge.
4. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a CA. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also requires that great weight is given to the preservation of designated heritage assets, such as the CA.
5. The significance of this part of the CA is largely derived from its open character and appearance. The development would result in a new garage within this open environment. I consider that this would constitute harm to the CA, albeit less than substantial, because it would harm a small part of the wider CA.
6. Further, and in addition to the garage, the proposal includes a new separate driveway access being created to serve Dean Croft. This would result in a reduction in the existing hedge and verge to the front of the property, as well

as a change in the levels in order to accommodate the proposed garage. This would also constitute less than substantial harm to the CA.

7. Further, as required by paragraph 196 of the Framework, I do not consider the appellants' case provides a public benefit that would outweigh the harm I have identified. The proposals are therefore contrary to this part of the Framework.
8. I consider that the position of the garage and new driveway, as well as the loss of hedgerow and change in levels would alter the open character of the area, resulting in less than substantial harm to the CA. I find this to be contrary to Policies HQ/1 and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018) both of which seek, amongst other things, to sustain, preserve and enhance designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellants' case that the garage would provide additional vehicle security and that the proposed garage is required to store a classic car. The appellants state that the removal of the car trailer currently in situ on the driveway would therefore result in a positive visual impact. However, the trailer is mobile and temporary, and I do not consider its impact on the CA is comparable with what would be a much larger and permanent structure.
10. I note that the highway authority did not object to the proposals and that the appellants proposed both a design and materials palette that would be sympathetic to its surroundings. Nevertheless, neither this nor any other material consideration that has been advanced outweighs the harm that I have identified above.
11. Finally, I note that the appellant has cited No 23 High Street as an example of where a similar scheme has attracted permission. That site has a different character, being located behind a brick wall and is more visually enclosed than that of the appeal site. I therefore consider that the appeal site is different in the way in which it contributes to the significance of the CA. Notwithstanding this, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR